UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
Southwest Region
501 West Ocean Boulevard, Suite 4200
Long Beach, California 90802-4213
Tel (310) 980-4000; FAX (310) 980-4018

Mr. Karl E. Wirkus
Bureau of Reclamation
Klamath Basin Area Office
6600 Washburn Way
Klamath Falls, Oregon 97603

Dear Mr. Wirkus,

The purpose of this letter is to transmit a draft biological opinion regarding the impacts of the on-going Klamath Project operations on Southern Oregon/Northern California (SONCC) coho salmon, a species listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (see enclosure).

On January 22, 2001, the Bureau of Reclamation requested formal section 7 consultation on the effects of the on-going operations of the Klamath Project on SONCC coho salmon. After reviewing the current status of SONCC coho salmon, the environmental baseline for the action area, the effects of the proposed action (i.e., ongoing operation of the Klamath Project on into the future), and cumulative effects, it is NMFS' biological opinion that the action, as proposed, is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of SONCC coho salmon. The NMFS has also determined that the action, as proposed, is likely to adversely modify critical habitat for the SONCC coho salmon. The general basis for these conclusions is that operation of the Klamath Project according to the proposed action outlined in your January 22, 2001, biological assessment will result in further degradation of aquatic habitat in the Klamath River below Iron gate Dam, even when compared with operations over the last 40 years. In turn, survival of several freshwater life history stages of coho salmon would be expected to decrease, resulting in unacceptable risk to the species.

The NMFS is providing the Bureau of Reclamation with a draft biological opinion and a reasonable and prudent alternative that includes an interim flow recommendation for a "dry" water year between April and September, pending the outcome of further study. Additional information and analyses are expected to be developed in the near future and this may result in a more refined RPA and flow recommendations for dry years as well as provide additional insight for other water year type flow recommendations. After that time, NMFS intends to prepare a subsequent, supplemental biological opinion addressing all water year types.

If you have questions, please contact Ms. Irma Lagomarsino, Supervisor of our Arcata Office, 1655 Heindon Road, Arcata, CA at (707) 825-5160. To meet your request that we issue a biological opinion by about April 1, 2001, please formally submit any comments on the draft opinion to Ms. Lagomarsino by March 23, 2001. If you want to extend this deadline, please advise us as soon as possible. All requests for copies of the draft biological opinion will be referred to your office.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Lent, Ph.D.
Regional Administrator

Enclosure

D:\WPdocs\LOP96-2BOcoverletter

DRAFT

Biological Opinion

Ongoing Klamath Project Operations

[DATE]

National Marine Fisheries Service
Southwest Region

DRAFT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DRAFT

Consultation History

The Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) forwarded a final biological assessment (BA) addressing their 1998 Operations Plan for their Klamath Project (Project) to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on June 2, 1998 (letter and enclosed BA from K. Wirkus, Reclamation, to D. Reck, NMFS). The June 2, 1998, transmittal letter stated that the "...BA fulfills Reclamation's responsibilities...under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act [ESA] regarding preparation of the BA and for providing information for determining the need for formal consultation." Although NMFS considered this, functionally, as a request for formal consultation under the ESA, insufficient human resources precluded proceeding with formal consultation until preparation of Reclamation's 1999 Project Operations Plan (D. Reck, Fishery Biologist, NMFS, pers. comm.).

On March 9, 1999, Reclamation forwarded a draft Klamath Project 1999 Annual Operations Plan Environmental Assessment (EA) to NMFS (and the public), and requested formal consultation under section 7 of the ESA (letter and enclosed draft EA from K. Wirkus, Reclamation, to D. Reck, NMFS). The March 9, 1999, transmittal letter stated that the "...preferred alternative in the 1999 EA is virtually the same as...[that] presented in the 1998 EA." On June 18, 1999, Reclamation modified their proposed April 1999 through March 2000 operations of the Project as described in a letter from K. Wirkus to D. Reck. On July 12, 1999, NMFS issued a biological opinion on operation of the Project through March 2000.

On April 4, 2000, NMFS informed Reclamation that the 2000 Opinion and associated incidental take statement had expired on March 31, 2000, and that they should request ESA section 7 consultation regarding operation of the Klamath Project (letter from R. McInnis, Acting Regional Administrator, NMFS, to K. Wirkus).

On April 26, 2000, Reclamation acknowledged that section 7(d) of the ESA prohibits the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources that foreclose the formulation of reasonable and prudent alternatives which would avoid violating section 7(a)(2) of the ESA (letter from K. Wirkus to R. McInnis). Specifically, the April 26, 2000, letter stated that "[b]ased on the information available to Reclamation at this date, we have determined that the proposed flows [included in the April 26, 2000, letter]...are both sufficient and necessary to avoid possible 7(d) foreclosures and to fulfill Reclamation's obligation to protect Tribal trust resources."

Subsequently Reclamation requested initiation of formal ESA section 7 consultation regarding the ongoing operation of the Klamath Project (January 22, 2001, letter and enclosures from K. Wirkus, Reclamation, to R. Lent, Regional Administrator, NMFS). The January 22, 2001, letter included an enclosed January 22, 2001, "biological assessment of the Klamath Project's continuing operations on southern Oregon/northern California ESU coho salmon and critical habitat for southern

Oregon/northern California ESU coho salmon" (ongoing Project operations BA, Reclamation [2001]).

Background

The Project is located in southern Oregon and provides irrigation water for approximately 220,000 acres in three counties located in Oregon and California. Project water is stored primarily in Upper Klamath Lake in the headwaters of the Klamath River Basin and Gerber and Clear Lake reservoirs in the Lost River watershed. Project facilities are located upstream of Iron Gate Dam (IGD), owned and operated by PacifiCorp, which is currently a barrier to anadromous salmonid migrations in the mainstem Klamath River. The development of dams in this location of the Klamath River began with Klamathon Dam prior to 1900. Copco no. 1 dam was completed in 1918, and by 1921 Link River Dam was constructed to supply water for irrigated agriculture and wildlife refuges, and to supply power. The construction of Copco no. 2 dam was completed in 1925, supplying more hydroelectric power. Due to high fluctuations in flow releases from Copco, the United States Bureau of Fisheries recommended an "equalizing dam" be constructed below Copco no. 2 dam to stabilize flows. IGD construction was completed in 1962 and is located at approximately river mile 190. A minimum flow regime was prescribed in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license covering operation of IGD.

Although a myriad of human induced and natural factors affect fish species of concern in the Klamath River, Project operation largely affects water available for release from IGD during portions of the year. In turn, flow releases from IGD affect the quantity and quality of aquatic habitat in the mainstem Klamath River in California. Investigations into an appropriate flow regime below IGD have resulted in several recommendations, and ongoing data collection and analysis efforts are expected to provide for refined recommendations in the future. These topics are discussed in the "Effects of the Action" section of this biological opinion.

Since 1996, Reclamation has been planning their operations of the Project annually. During this same period, Reclamation has been working to develop a multi-year operations plan and more recently has been preparing a draft Environmental Impact Statement describing the effects of future alternative Project operations.

The objective of this biological opinion (Opinion) is to determine whether the proposed ongoing operation of the Klamath Project is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of threatened southern Oregon/northern California Coasts (SONCC) coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*). Klamath Mountains Province (KMP) steelhead occur in the Klamath River and are proposed for listing as threatened under the ESA (February 12, 2001; 66 FR 9808). The status of this ESU will be reevaluated in the near future, and operations consistent with ESA requirements with respect to coho salmon are expected to generally benefit steelhead in the Klamath River. If KMP steelhead are listed under the ESA, NMFS will address the effects of Project operations on KMP steelhead during future section 7 consultation(s).

Critical habitat has been designated for SONCC coho salmon. Conclusions regarding destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat are included in this Opinion.

Description of the Proposed Action

Reclamation prepared a BA (Reclamation 2001) describing proposed ongoing Project operations from the present until such time as additional ESA consultation addressing a future Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) supercedes the resulting 2001 NMFS biological opinion. Actions proposed within the ongoing Project operations BA included providing water for agriculture, National Wildlife Refuges, and downstream aquatic habitat. In addition, Upper Klamath Lake is managed to protect endangered fish under the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) ESA jurisdiction. Other actions proposed included participation in salmon and steelhead monitoring activities in the Klamath River, the continued implementation of Reclamation's Water Supply Initiative aimed at obtaining additional water supplies, conducting a feasibility study on raising the maximum operating water surface elevation of Upper Klamath Lake by up to 2 feet, implementation of several groundwater investigations, conducting an appraisal study on raising Gerber Dam by 3 feet, and development of a management plan for Agency Lake Ranch.

PacifiCorp operates Link River Dam in accordance with Reclamation's annual operations plans for the Klamath Project, and owns and operates Keno Dam, J.C. Boyle Dam, Copco No. 1 and Copco No. 2 Dams, and Iron Gate Dam, downstream of Reclamation's Klamath Project. In their ongoing Project operations BA., Reclamation also proposes to work to develop a plan of closer operational coordination and data sharing with PacifiCorp to reduce the scope of impacts of depressed flows that occur during the April through June period. NMFS believes that this is intended to address IGD flow ramping concerns during this period.

The ongoing Project operations BA includes specific proposed average minimum flows for release at Iron Gate Dam, by four water year types (see Table 1). These water year types are defined in terms of April through September inflow to Upper Klamath Lake: Above Average (>500,400 acre feet [af]); Below Average (312,800 - 500,400 af); Dry (185,000 - 312,800 af); and Critical (<185,000 af). These proposed minimum flows are the average monthly or biweekly (as applicable) minimums that were measured below Iron Gate Dam during the 1961 through 1997 period, by water year type (Reclamation 2001).

<u>Description of the Action Area</u>
For the purposes of this Opinion, the action area is defined as the Klamath River downstream of IGD, located at approximately river mile 190, in northern California.

Species Description

The coho salmon is an anadromous salmonid species that was historically widely distributed throughout the North Pacific Ocean from central California to Point Hope, Alaska, through the Aleutian Islands, and from Anadyr River, Russia, south to Hokkaido, Japan. Coho salmon are very similar in appearance to chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*) while at sea (blue-green back with sliver flanks), but they are smaller than chinook salmon. Coho salmon adults can be distinguished from small chinook salmon by the lack of spots on the lower portion of the tail. During the twentieth century, naturally-producing populations of coho salmon have declined or have been extirpated in California, Oregon, and Washington. The coho salmon status review (Weitcamp et al. 1995) identified six distinct population segments (Evolutionarily Significant Units - ESUs) in these states and noted that natural runs in all ESUs are substantially below historical levels (Weitcamp et al. 1995). The action area is within the range of the SONCC coho salmon ESU.

Life History

General life history information for coho salmon is summarized below. Further information is available in the status review (Weitcamp et al. 1995), the proposed rule for listing coho salmon (July 25, 1995; 60 FR 38011), and the final rule listing the SONCC coho salmon ESU (May 6, 1997; 62 FR 24588).

In contrast to the life history patterns of other Pacific salmonids, coho salmon generally exhibit a relatively simple three-year life cycle. They spend approximately 18 months in freshwater and 18 months in salt water (Shapovalov and Taft 1954). The primary exception to this pattern are "jacks," which are sexually mature males that return to fresh water to spawn after only 5 to 7 months in the ocean. Most coho salmon enter rivers between September and February and spawn from November to January (Hassler 1987), and occasionally into February and March (Weitkamp et al. 1995). Coho salmon river entry timing is influenced by many factors, one of which appears to be river flow (Sandercock 1991). In addition, many small California stream systems have sandbars which block their mouths for most of the year except winter. In these systems, coho salmon and other Pacific salmonid species are unable to enter the rivers until sufficiently strong freshets open passages through the bars (Weitkamp et al. 1995). In general, earlier migrating fish spawn farther upstream within a basin than later migrating fish, which enter rivers in a more advanced state of sexual maturity (Sandercock 1991). Spawning is concentrated in riffles or in gravel deposits at the downstream end of pools with suitable water depth and velocity.

Coho salmon eggs incubate for approximately 35 to 50 days between November and March. The duration of incubation may change depending on ambient water temperatures (Shapovalov and Taft 1954). Successful incubation depends on several factors including dissolved oxygen levels, temperature, substrate size, amount of fine sediment, and water velocity. Fry start emerging from the gravel two to three weeks after hatching (Hassler 1987). Following emergence, fry move into shallow areas near the stream banks. As coho salmon fry grow larger, they disperse upstream and downstream and establish and defend a territory (Hassler 1987).

During the summer, coho salmon fry prefer pools and riffles featuring adequate cover such as large woody debris, undercut banks, and overhanging vegetation. Juvenile coho salmon prefer to over-winter in large mainstem pools, backwater areas and secondary pools with large woody debris, and undercut bank areas (Hassler 1987; Heifetz et al. 1986). Juveniles primarily eat aquatic and terrestrial insects (Sandercock 1991). Coho salmon rear in fresh water for up to 15 months, then migrate to the sea as smolts between March and June (Weitkamp et al. 1995).

While living in the ocean, coho salmon remain closer to their river of origin than do chinook salmon (Weitkamp et al. 1995). Nevertheless, coho salmon have been captured several hundred to several thousand kilometers away from their natal stream (Hassler 1987). Coho salmon typically spend two growing seasons in the ocean before returning to their natal streams to spawn as three year-olds.

Population Trends

Available historical and recent coho salmon abundance information is summarized in the NMFS coast-wide status review (Weitkamp et al. 1995). Following are some excerpts from this document.

Gold Ray Dam adult coho passage counts provide a long-term view of coho salmon abundance in the upper Rogue River. During the 1940s, counts averaged ca. 2,000 adult coho salmon per year. Between the late 1960s and early 1970s, adult counts averaged fewer than 200. During the late 1970s, dam counts increased, corresponding with returning coho salmon produced at Cole Rivers Hatchery. Coho salmon run size estimates derived from seine surveys at Huntley Park near the mouth of the Rogue River have ranged from ca. 450 to 19,200 naturally-produced adults between 1979 and 1991. In Oregon south of Cape Blanco, Nehlsen et al. (1991) considered all but one coho salmon population to be at "high risk of extinction." South of Cape Blanco, Nickelson et al. (1992) rated all Oregon coho salmon populations as "depressed."

Brown and Moyle (1991) estimated that naturally-spawned adult coho salmon returning to California streams were less than one percent of their abundance at mid-century, and indigenous, wild coho salmon populations in California did not exceed 100 to 1,300 individuals. Further, they stated that 46 percent of California streams which historically supported coho salmon populations, and for which recent data were available, no longer supported runs.

No regular spawning escapement estimates exist for natural coho salmon in California streams. California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) (1994) recently summarized most information for the northern California region of this ESU. They concluded that "coho salmon in California, including hatchery populations, could be less than six percent of their abundance during the 1940s, and have experienced at least a 70 percent decline in the 1960s." Further, they reported that coho salmon populations have been virtually eliminated in many streams, and that adults are observed only every third year in some streams, suggesting that two of three brood cycles may already have been eliminated.

The rivers and tributaries in the California portion of this ESU were estimated to have average recent runs of 7,080 natural spawners and 17,156 hatchery returns, with 4,480 identified as "native" fish occurring in tributaries having little history of supplementation with non-native fish. Combining recent run-size estimates for the California portion of this ESU with Rogue River estimates provides a rough minimum run-size estimate for the entire ESU of about 10,000 natural fish and 20,000 hatchery fish (May 6, 1997; 62 FR 24588).

Small numbers of adult coho salmon have been counted in a few Klamath River tributaries (USFWS electronic database). These counts do not necessarily reflect the total populations as counting weirs were sometimes removed prior to the end of the coho salmon run. Between 1981 and 1986 (four years sampled), an average of about 5 adults (range of 0 to 12) were counted at a weir in Bogus Creek. Shasta River trapping efforts yielded an average of about 11 adults between 1990 and 1995 (range of 4 to 17) . Weir counts in the Scott River were an average of about 25 during the 1982 to 1986 period (range of 5 to 37). Finally, in the Trinity River, naturally produced coho salmon adults count estimates at the Willow Creek weir averaged about 390 between 1991 and 1999 (range of 0 to 1,132) (electronic database from CDFG).

Current Status

Listing History

The SONCC coho salmon ESU was listed as threatened under the ESA on May 6, 1997 (62 FR 24588). This ESU includes coho salmon populations between Cape Blanco, Oregon, and Punta Gorda, California. An interim rule under section 4(d) of the ESA was published on July 18, 1997 (62 FR 3847) applying the prohibitions contained in section 9(a) of the ESA to the California portion of the ESU. Critical habitat was designated for the SONCC coho salmon ESU on May 5, 1999 (64 FR 24049). Critical habitat includes all waterways, substrate, and adjacent riparian zones below longstanding, naturally impassable barriers (i.e., natural waterfalls in existence for at least several hundred years). NMFS has identified twelve dams in the range of these ESUs that currently block access to habitats historically occupied by coho salmon. However, NMFS has not proposed these inaccessible areas as critical habitat because areas downstream were believed to be sufficient for the conservation of the ESUs.

Threats

The SONCC coho salmon ESU was listed as threatened due to numerous factors including several long-standing, human-induced factors (e.g., habitat degradation, harvest, water diversions, and artificial propagation) that exacerbate the adverse effects of natural environmental variability (e.g., floods, drought, poor ocean conditions). Habitat factors that may contribute to the decline of coho salmon in the SONCC ESU include changes in channel morphology, substrate changes, loss of instream roughness and complexity, loss of estuarine habitat, loss of wetlands, loss and/or degradation of riparian areas, declines in water quality, altered stream flows, impediments to fish passage, and elimination of habitat. The major activities identified as responsible for the decline of coho salmon in Oregon and California include logging, road building, grazing, mining, urbanization, stream channelization, dams, wetland loss, beaver trapping, water withdrawals, and unscreened diversions for irrigation (May 6, 1997; 62 FR 24588).

Tribal harvest is not considered a major factor in the decline of coho salmon in the SONCC ESU. In contrast, over fishing in non-tribal fisheries is believed to have been a significant factor (May 6, 1997; 62 FR 24588). Disease and predation are not believed to be major causes in the species decline, however, they may have substantial impacts in local areas. For example, Higgins et al. (1992) and CDFG (1994) reported that Sacramento River squawfish have been found in the Eel River basin and are considered to be a major threat to native coho salmon. Furthermore, California sea lions and Pacific harbor seals, which occur in most estuaries and rivers where salmonid runs occur on the west coast, are known predators of salmonids. Harbor seals are present year-round near Cape Mendocino. California sea lions are present near Cape Mendocino in the fall and spring. At the mouth of the Eel River, harbor seals haul-out in large numbers (600-1,050 seals). More than 1,200 harbor seals have been counted in the vicinity of Trinidad Head. Coho salmon may be vulnerable to impacts from pinniped predation. In the final rule listing the SONCC coho salmon ESU, NMFS indicated that it was unlikely that pinniped predation was a significant factor in the decline of coho salmon on the west coast, although they may be a threat to existing depressed local populations. The NMFS (1997) has recently determined that although pinniped predation did not cause the decline of salmonid populations, in localized areas where they co-occur with salmonids (especially where salmonids concentrate or passage may be constricted), predation may preclude recovery of these populations. Specific areas where predation is/may preclude recovery cannot be determined without extensive studies.

Artificial propagation is also a factor in the decline of coho salmon due to the genetic impacts on indigenous, naturally-reproducing populations, disease transmission, predation of wild fish, depletion of wild stock to enhance brood stock, and replacement rather than supplementation of wild stocks through competition and the continued annual introduction of hatchery fish.

Existing regulatory mechanisms, including land management plans (e.g., National Forest Land Management Plans, State Forest Practice Rules), Clean Water Act section 404 activities, urban growth management, and harvest and hatchery management all contributed to varying degrees to the decline of coho salmon due to lack of protective measures, the inadequacy of existing measures to protect coho salmon and/or its habitat, or the failure to carry out established protective measures. Since the listing of the SONCC coho salmon ESU, no new threats have been identified.

Environmental Baseline

The environmental baseline is an analysis of the effects of past and ongoing human and natural factors leading to the current status of the species. The environmental baseline includes the past and present impacts of all federal, state, or private actions and other human activities in the action area (50 CFR § 402.02), and a summary of the status of threatened and endangered species in the action area.

The environmental baseline sections of NMFS biological opinions usually summarize the effects of past and present human and natural phenomena on the current status of threatened and endangered species and their habitat in an action area. The environmental baseline usually establishes the base condition for natural resources, human usage, and species status in an action area which would be used as a point of comparison for evaluating the effects of an action.

In this biological opinion, however, NMFS is considering an action that requires us to deviate from that approach to establishing environmental baselines for an action. Specifically, Klamath Project operations and associated activities have occurred for at least 70 years, which pre-dates the ESA of 1973. The ongoing operations of the Project described in the BA (Reclamation 2001) are a "proposed action," however, Project construction and operation have continued since the early 1900s, and thus in effect are a part of the environmental baseline. The effects of Project operation are, in part, reflected in the current status of the species being considered in this biological opinion.

Consequently, NMFS will treat all effects of Klamath Project operations that occurred during the life of the project as part of the environmental baseline for this biological opinion. The NMFS also observes that the Project has generally been operated to provide water to meet minimum flow targets below IGD since about 1962. The "Effects of the Action" section of this biological opinion will consider the expected effects of proposed Project operations, if continued unchanged into the future.

The factors presenting risks to naturally-reproducing coho salmon populations are numerous and varied. The Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force (KRBFTF, created in 1986 by Public Law 99-552) described salmon and steelhead habitat issues in their Long Range Basin Restoration Plan (KRBFTF 1991). Habitat issues were discussed by type of associated human activities: Land management (timber harvesting, mining, and agriculture) and water management (water and power projects, and water diversions) categories. The KRBTFT described the history of these issues, and the activities that have led to present aquatic habitat conditions. Following is a supplemented summary of the KRBFTF's discussion of these issues.

Land Management

Industrious land management began in the late 1880s. During the Depression, many new roads were built in the Klamath Basin and new territory was opened up for logging. Many of these roads featured stream crossings that were not designed to allow for upstream and downstream fish passage. After World War II, technological improvements such as power saws, bulldozers, rafts, tugs, trucks and trailers allowed for an increased rate of timber harvest in the Basin. Many of these activities had deleterious effects to the watershed, transferring soils and logging debris into small streams and tributaries, effectively destroying fish habitat.

Roads associated with timber harvesting account for a large portion of the erosion occurring in logged areas. Poor road design, location, construction and maintenance caused erosion of all types: mass soil movement, surface, gullies, and stream bank. Harvesting has expanded from established roads into more inaccessible terrain and areas of greater environmental risk.

The effects of land management activities on streams and fish habitat are well documented (Sullivan et al. 1987; Hartman and Scrivener 1990; Meehan 1991). Forest management activities that influence the quantity, quality, or timing of stream flows affect fish habitat primarily through changes in the normal levels of peak flows or low flows (Sullivan et al. 1987; Chamberlin et al. 1991). Water outflow from hillsides to streams are affected through changes in evapotranspiration, soil water content, and soil structure. In general, timber management activities allow more water to reach the ground, and may alter water infiltration into forest soils such that less water is absorbed or the soil may become saturated faster thereby increasing surface flow. Road systems, skid trails, and landings where the soils become compacted may also accelerate runoff. Ditches concentrate surface runoff and intercept subsurface flow bringing it to the surface (Chamberlin et al. 1991; Furniss et al. 1991). Significant increases in the magnitude of peak flows or the frequency of channel forming flows can increase channel scouring or accelerate bank erosion.

Increases in sediment contributions to streams are generally attributable to changes in rates of erosion on hillslopes through such processes as increased landslide activity, sheetwash erosion associated with road management activities (construction and maintenance) and yarding operations, and fires (both wildfires and controlled burns). The largest contributions of sediment are typically from road construction activities (Furniss et al. 1991). Significant increases in the sediment supplied to streams can cause channel aggradation, pool filling, additional bank erosion, and losses of channel structures and habitat diversity. Stable large woody debris structures within the stream channel may be lost through direct removal, channel aggradation, debris torrents, or gradual attrition through lack of recruitment. These losses result in a reduction in sediment storage capacity, fewer and shallower scour pools, and a reduction of instream cover for fish (Chamberlin et al. 1991).

Changes in peak flows and sediment yield directly related to the removal of vegetation will typically persist for only a few years and tend to decrease over time as the watershed recovers and new vegetation grows. Changes associated with roads persist indefinitely as roads are maintained or abandoned without treatment. Stream channel responses may take decades or centuries to recover (Chamberlin et al. 1991; Furniss et al. 1991).

Mining activities within the Klamath Basin began prior to 1900. Many of the communities in the Klamath River Basin originated with the gold mining boom in the 1800s. Water was diverted and pumped for use in sluicing and hydraulic mining operations. This resulted in dramatic increases in turbidity levels altering stream morphology. Some believed that the hydraulic mining period resulted in greater impacts to the salmon fishery than the large fish canneries of the era. The negative impacts of stream siltation on fish abundance was observed as early as the 1930s. Several streams impacted by mining operations and containing large volumes of silt seldom had large populations of salmon or trout (Smith 1939).

Since the 1970s, mining operations have been curtailed due to stricter environmental regulations. However, mining operations continue including suction dredging, placer mining, gravel mining, and lode mining. These mining operations can adversely affect spawning gravels, result in increased poaching activity, decreased survival of fish eggs and juveniles, decrease benthic invertebrate abundance, adversely affect water quality, and impact stream banks and channels.

Crop cultivation and livestock grazing in the upper Klamath Basin began in the mid-1850s. Since then, valleys have been cleared of brush and trees to provide more farm land. By the turn of the century, native perennial grasses were replaced by various species of annual grasses and forbes. This, combined with soil compaction, resulted in higher surface erosion and greater peak water flows in streams. Other annual and perennial crops cultivated included grains, alfalfa hay, potatoes and corn.

As the value of farm lands increased, flood control measures were implemented. During the 1930s, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers implemented flood control measures in the Scott River valley by removing riparian vegetation and building dikes to constrain the stream channel. As a result, the river channelized, water velocities increased, and the rate of bank erosion accelerated. To minimize damage, the Siskiyou Soil Conservation Service planted willows along the streambank and recommended channel modifications take place that re-shaped the stream channel in a series of gentle curves.

Agricultural practices may adversely impact the aquatic environment. Stream pollution from agriculture runoff is a persistent cause of damage. Animal wastes, fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides enter the stream as a result of storm runoff and return flows from irrigation. This has resulted in elevated nutrient levels in the Klamath River and some tributaries. Livestock trampling in and near the stream channel can reduce fish egg survival and increase sedimentation due to bank erosion. Agricultural practices that reduce riparian vegetation in turn reduce large woody debris recruitment and simplify the stream channel. Removal of riparian vegetation has also resulted in elevated water temperatures in the Klamath Basin. Temperatures periodically reach levels that are lethal to some fish species. This, combined with elevated nutrient levels results in stimulation of aquatic plant and algae growth. As water temperatures rise and plants and algae decompose, the level of dissolved oxygen decreases. Dissolved oxygen levels in the Klamath River often fall below the state's water quality objective of 7.0 mg/l.

Current Federal Land Management

Since 1994, the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management have been managing their lands in the Klamath River Basin consistent with the Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (Northwest Forest Plan; USDA and USDI 1994). This is expected to result in improved freshwater salmon habitat conditions within Federal forest lands through time, as conservative approaches to timber harvest and road-related activities are applied. The NMFS previously completed a biological opinion on the continued implementation of the Northwest Forest Plan on Bureau of Land Management and National Forest lands in the basin.

Water Management

The upper Klamath River Basin is at relatively high elevations and features seasonal accumulations of snow. Also, numerous lakes and wetlands serve to store and gradually release winter precipitation. The Basin is underlain with pervious, water- bearing volcanic rock. Under natural conditions the upper Klamath Basin was the principal source of late summer Klamath River flows, and of flows during years of below-normal precipitation and extended drought (Hecht and Kamman 1996).

Dams impounding water for mining and farming operations were first built in the Klamath Basin during the 1850s. Some of these dams blocked fish passage in a number of tributary streams. The first hydroelectric dams were built in the Shasta River and the upper Klamath River Basin just prior to the turn of the century.

In 1905, Reclamation began developing its irrigation project near Klamath Falls, Oregon. Marshes were drained, dikes and levees were constructed, and the level of Upper Klamath Lake was raised. Irrigation water in the upper Basin was primarily provided by diversion from Upper Klamath Lake and the Lost River system.

Starting around 1912, construction and operation of the numerous facilities associated with the Project have significantly altered the natural hydrographs of the upper and lower Klamath River. These facilities include the A-Canal, Lost River Diversion Dam, Copco Nos. 1 and 2 Dams, J.C. Boyle Hydroelectric Dam, IGD, and Keno Dam. Changes in the flow regime at Keno, Oregon, after the construction of the A-Canal, Link River Dam, and the Lost River Diversion Dam, can be seen in the 1930-to-present flow records. These changes include a reduction of average summer monthly flows, and alteration of the natural seasonal variation of flows to meet peak power and diversion demands (Hecht and Kamman 1996).

The Copco facilities were operated in power-peaking mode, and flow releases fluctuated according to anticipated energy demands. Flows could vary by an order of magnitude or more within a 20 minute period, creating a hazard for both fish and fishermen. Fish and their food base were often stranded, resulting in mortality. The detrimental effect to the fishery was pronounced (KRBFTF 1991).

Hecht and Kamman (1996) viewed the hydrologic records for similar water years (pre- and post-Project) at several locations. The authors concluded that: (1) there was much less variability between mean, minimum and maximum flows in the Klamath River at Keno prior to construction of the Project, and (2) the timing of peak and low flows changed significantly after construction of the Project and operation increases flows in October and November and decreases flows in the late spring and summer as measured at Keno, Seiad, and Klamath. Their report also noted that water diversions in areas outside the Project boundaries occur as well.

Around the 1920s, water resources in the Shasta and Scott Rivers were developed for irrigated agriculture. Dwinell Dam in the Shasta River Basin was constructed in 1928 to impound irrigation water for the Montague Water Conservation District. The dam effectively blocked access to the southern headwaters. No minimum flow regimes were established, and the nutrient-rich Lake Shastina reservoir suffered from elevated water temperatures, increased algae growth, and decreased dissolved oxygen levels. Nutrient sources into the Lake include those from agricultural, urban, and suburban land use. The Dam also prevented spawning gravel recruitment into the downstream River reach.

By the 1960s, CDFG noted that diversion dams denied fish migration passage over numerous diversion dams in the Shasta River, and in 1974, CDFG noted that agricultural activities and fishery values were largely incompatible. While natural low water conditions can be unfavorable to salmonids, the problem is exacerbated by numerous water diversions. The Shasta and Scott rivers historically supported strong populations of chinook salmon, coho salmon, and summer-run steelhead (KRBFTF 1991).

The Klamath River Compact was approved by Congress in 1957, and provided first water right priorities to irrigated agriculture, including a superior right for adequate water to irrigate 300,000 acres in addition to that land already irrigated ca. 1957 (KRBFTF 1991). Water for fish use (‘recreational use’) was third in priority. Numerous water right conflicts still exist, and the state of Oregon is currently adjudicating all water rights claims in the Oregon portion of the Klamath River Basin.

The IGD was completed by 1962 to re-regulate flow releases from the Copco facilities, but it did not restore the “pre-project” hydrograph. The pre-project hydrograph (at Keno, Oregon) and the post IGD hydrograph (below IGD) can be seen in Figures 1 and 2. Minimum stream flows and ramping rate regimes were established in the FERC license covering operation of IGD. As a mitigation measure for the loss of fish habitat between Iron Gate and Copco No. 2 Dams, a fish hatchery was established.

In 1964, Trinity and Lewiston Dams were completed in the Trinity River Basin. The initial operation plan diverted at least 80 percent of the Trinity River flow into the Sacramento River Basin. The remaining Trinity River flow was inadequate to meet the hydrological needs to maintain a healthy river system. Flood induced sediment transport ceased, and riparian vegetation encroached into the channel margin, "fossilizing" the bars and further impeding sediment transport above the North Fork Trinity River. In 1992, minimum flow releases from Lewiston Dam were slightly increased in the Trinity River.

The USFWS and the Hoopa Valley Tribe subsequently published the Trinity River Flow Evaluation Final Report (TRFE) in June 1999. Subsequently, the USFWS, Reclamation, Hoopa Valley Tribe, and Trinity County forwarded the TRFE recommendations as the preferred alternative in a draft EIS addressing mainstem Trinity River restoration. NMFS issued a biological opinion on the draft EIS preferred alternative and determined that implementation of the proposed actions was not likely to jeopardize SONCC coho salmon. In October 2000, the Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration final EIS was published, and an associated Record of Decision selecting the preferred alternative was signed by the Secretary of the Interior on December 19, 2000.

Indian tribes in the Klamath River Basin also have a profound interest in water management. Downstream tribal reserved water rights consist of an instream flow sufficient to protect the right to take fish within their reservations. The tribes' water rights may have a priority date as early as 1855, and include the right to prevent others from depleting the stream flow below a protected level and the right to water quality and flow to support all life history stages of fish (Reclamation 1999).

Summary of Water Quality Conditions

In addition to the hydrologic changes resulting from the activities discussed above, human activities have also resulted in degraded water quality in the action area. The Klamath River, from source to mouth, is listed as water quality impaired (by both Oregon and California) under Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act. In 1992, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) proposed that the Klamath River be listed for both temperature and nutrients, requiring the development of Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) limits and implementation plans. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) accepted this action in 1993. The basis for listing the Klamath River as impaired was aquatic habitat degradation due to excessively warm water temperatures and algae blooms associated with high nutrient loads, water impoundments, and agricultural water diversions (USEPA 1993).

In 1997, the NCRWQCB updated the 303(d) list and added dissolved oxygen as an additional limiting factor for aquatic habitat in the Klamath River (NCRWQCB 1998). The impairment listing regarding dissolved oxygen was prompted by a 1997 USFWS report. The USFWS concerns included the current status of salmonid populations in the Klamath River, the effects of past and current land use on water quality, annual fish and temperature monitoring data, documented fish kills, and current water quality monitoring data which indicate that acute and chronic values for temperature and dissolved oxygen are observed in the mainstem Klamath River, particularly during some summer periods (USFWS 1997). The Klamath River is scheduled to have TMDL's established for temperature, nutrients, and dissolved oxygen by December 31, 2004.

The fact that the Klamath River is listed for temperature, nutrients and dissolved oxygen is especially important due to the relationship between these three water quality parameters. As described by Campbell (1995), increased water temperatures and lower saturated oxygen concentrations typically occur in the Klamath River during summer months, the same time of year that the growth and respiration cycles of aquatic plants affect dissolved oxygen concentration. These three parameters interact synergistically, and can have a much greater impact on water quality and salmonids than either temperature or dissolved oxygen alone (Campbell 1995).

Nutrient loading leads to increased growth of aquatic plants and algae in the Klamath River channel. The growth of aquatic plants and algae fosters sediment accumulation which decreases the quality of salmonid spawning and rearing habitat and leads to decreased dissolved oxygen concentration and high pH values on a diel cycle (Campbell 1995). The increased growth of aquatic plants and algae can also retard water velocity at low stream flows, contributing to higher stream temperatures in the Klamath River (Trihey and Associates 1996).

Low flow conditions can cause an increase in absolute concentrations of water pollutants. In some geographic areas, high flows may result in lower concentrations of pollutants due to dilution (Campbell 1995). Increasing flows during summer months may improve water quality downstream, but the direct effect of IGD flows is diminished in the lower river during some times of the year. Another positive effect of increased flows on water quality is that of dampening the diurnal fluctuations in temperature and dissolved oxygen. Low stream flows compound high water temperature problems, because a smaller volume of water is more easily heated and cooled, causing larger diurnal changes in the water temperature of the Klamath River (Trihey and Associates 1996; INSE 1999).

The Klamath River has probably always been a relatively warm river (Hecht and Kamman 1996), although there are no historical data to confirm this nor characterize the historic temperature regime. More recently, using a weekly mean temperature of 15E C as a threshold for chronic salmonid stress and a daily mean temperature of 20E C as an acute threshold, the 1966-1982 Klamath River temperatures at Orleans violated the acute and chronic thresholds a substantial portion of the time (Bartholow 1995). Campbell (1995) analyzed water quality data for 22 sites in the Klamath basin, applying the 1986 USEPA criteria. The most common water quality criteria exceeded were temperature at all 22 sites, and dissolved oxygen concentration at 11 sites.

Coho Salmon Harvest

Overfishing in non-tribal fisheries is believed to have been a significant factor in the decline of coho salmon. This included significant overfishing that occurred from the time marine survival turned poor for many stocks (ca. 1976) until the mid-1990s when harvest was substantially curtailed (May 6, 1997; 62 FR 24588).

Since 1994, the retention of coho salmon has been prohibited in marine fisheries south of Cape Falcon, Oregon. Coho salmon are still impacted, however, as a result of hook-and-release mortality in chinook salmon-directed fisheries. Since 1970, the ocean exploitation rate index on Oregon Production Index (OPI) coho salmon stocks (including coho salmon ESUs listed under the ESA) have generally declined from a high of about 80 percent to less than 10 percent in recent years. This has resulted from implementing non-retention fisheries of the Oregon and California coasts. Sport and commercial fishing restrictions ranging from severe curtailment to complete closures in recent years may be providing an increase in adult coho salmon spawners in some streams, but trend cannot be established from the existing data.

Coho salmon from the action area are contacted by ocean fisheries primarily off California. Coded-wire tagged coho salmon released from hatcheries south of Cape Blanco have a southerly recovery pattern, primarily in California (65-92 percent), with some recoveries in Oregon (7-34 percent), and almost none (1 percent) in Washington or British Columbia (percent data represent range of recoveries for five hatcheries by state or province) (Weitcamp et al. 1995). Ocean exploitation rates for SONCC coho salmon are based on the exploitation rate on Rogue/Klamath hatchery stocks and have only recently become available. The estimated ocean exploitation rates were 5 percent in 1996 and 1997, 12 percent in 1998, and are projected to be 5 percent in 1999 (PFMC 1997, 1998, 1999). The extent to which coded-wire tagged recovery patterns of these hatchery stocks coincide with the distribution patterns of wild coho salmon is not known.

Brown et al. (1994) estimated that approximately 90 percent of the Klamath-Trinity basin coho salmon are of hatchery origin. The annual tribal harvest of coho salmon over the past 5 years has been reported as 670 fish, of which 70 may have been naturally spawning. If the minimum population of naturally spawning SONCC coho salmon is about 10,000 fish (Weitcamp et al. 1995), the tribal impact on listed coho salmon has been relatively small, on average less than 100 fish per year during the past 6 years and less than 1 percent of the SONCC coho salmon ESU. Estimated tribal harvest rates on Klamath Basin coho salmon averaged 5 percent from 1992-1997. There are no tribal fisheries on coho salmon populations in the Rogue, Smith, Eel, or Mattole rivers.

Hatchery Programs

Large hatcheries in the SONCC coho salmon ESU (e.g., Mad River, Trinity River) have released 400,000-600,000 coho salmon annually between 1987 and 1991. In addition, Cole Rivers Hatchery and Iron Gate Hatchery released an average of about 270,000 and 150,000 coho salmon, respectively, during this period. All coho salmon hatchery programs in the California portion of this ESU have a history of transplants from areas outside of the SONCC coho salmon ESU. Although records are incomplete, the frequency and magnitude of out-of-basin-plants in this ESU appears to be relatively low (Weitcamp et al. 1995).

The Klamath and Trinity Basin coho salmon runs are now composed largely of hatchery fish, although there still may be wild runs remaining in some tributaries (CDFG 1994). Because of the predominance of hatchery stocks in the Klamath River Basin, stock transfers into the Trinity and Iron Gate Hatcheries may have had a substantial impact on natural populations in the basin (July 25, 1995; 60 FR 38011).

Integration and Synthesis of the Environmental Baseline

The decline of Pacific Salmonids is not the result of a single factor, and to search for the single cause is a misleading oversimplification. Multiple factors have contributed to the decline and multiple factors may still be preventing recovery. The identification of one such factor does not rule out the possibility that others are also acting, perhaps synergistically, to prolong the decline. Furthermore, the causes for the decline appear to include both natural and anthropogenic influences.

Coho salmon stocks in the northern California region of the SONCC coho salmon ESU could be at less than six percent of their abundance during the 1940s and have declined at least a 70 percent since the 1960s. This decline prompted NMFS to list the SONCC ESU as threatened. Likewise, populations of chinook salmon, steelhead, and coastal cutthroat trout have declined to levels that have warranted their consideration for listing.

Dam construction has blocked access to coho salmon habitat in the Eel, Mad, Trinity, Klamath, and Rogue River Basins. Within the Klamath River Basin, an estimated 20 percent of historical coho salmon habitat is no longer available (November 25, 1997; 62 FR 62741). This undoubtably decreased the production capacity of the basin.

Water development in the Klamath Basin has altered the hydrology, and the magnitude and timing of water flows has dramatically changed in the Trinity, Klamath, Shasta, and Scott Rivers. Agricultural activities associated with Klamath Basin diversions have also contributed to increased nutrient loading. Undoubtably these activities resulted in adverse affects to coho salmon (and other salmonids), as these fish are adapted to historical flow conditions and high water quality.

Timber harvest activities, associated road construction, grazing, and mining activities have also degraded aquatic habitat conditions. This was acknowledged and addressed in the Northwest Forest

Plan (USDA and USDI 1994) that guides federal land management activities in the Klamath Basin.

The entire Klamath River is listed under the Clean Water Act as water quality impaired. The river is not scheduled for TMDL and implementation plans to be established until about 2005.

Previous coho salmon harvest activities have previously contributed to the decline of SONCC coho salmon. Ocean harvest rates for coho salmon remain at approximately 5 percent. Poor and uncertain hatchery practices in the past continue to have lingering adverse affects on natural populations in the action area.

In the face of all these changes and influencing factors, the SONCC coho salmon may not be able to maintain themselves. The available evidence suggests that a significant part of the problem is lack of properly functioning habitat.

Effects of the Action

<u>Analysis Approach</u>

Operation of the Project as described in the ongoing Project operations BA (Reclamation 2001) will affect flows in the Klamath River below the Project during portions of any given year, as well as affect water quality. In turn, changes in flow due to Project operations will affect the amount of suitable habitat available to coho salmon in the Klamath River. The relationship between changes in habitat quantity and quality, and the status and trends of fish and wildlife populations has been the subject of extensive scientific research and publication, and the assumptions underlying our assessment are consistent with this extensive scientific base of knowledge. For detailed discussions of the relationship between habitat variables and the status of salmon populations, readers should refer to the work of FEMAT (USDA Forest Service et al. 1993), Gregory and Bisson (1997), Hicks et al. (1991), Murphy (1995), National Research Council (1996), Nehlsen et al. (1991), Spence et al. (1996), Thomas et al. (1993), The Wilderness Society (1993), and others.

The relationship between habitat and populations is embodied in the concept of carrying capacity. The concept of carrying capacity recognizes that a specific area of land or water can support a finite population of a particular species because food and other resources in that area are finite (Odum 1971). By extension, increasing the carrying capacity of an area (increasing the quality or quantity of resources available to a population within that area) increases the number of individuals the area can sustain over time. By the same reasoning, decreasing the carrying capacity of an area (decreasing the quality or quantity of resources available to a population) decreases the number of individuals the area can support over time. In either case, there is a corresponding, but non-linear relationship between changes in the quality and quantity of resources available to a species in an area and the number of individuals that the area can support.

The approach used in this assessment is intended to determine if the ongoing and proposed action is likely to degrade the quantity and quality of natural resources necessary to support populations of coho salmon in the action area. Finally, the assessment approach is intended to determine if any changes are likely to decrease the size, number, dynamics, or distribution of listed coho salmon populations in the action area in ways that appreciably reduce the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of SONCC coho salmon in the wild.

<u>Effects of Flow Regulation</u>

Coho salmon populations occur in the mainstem Klamath River year round, and also inhabit a number of tributaries (Henriksen 1995; INSE 1999). Between Seiad Valley and IGD, coho salmon populations are believed to occur in Bogus Creek, Shasta River, Humbug Creek, Empire Creek, Beaver Creek, Horse Creek, and Scott River. Between Orleans and Seiad Valley, coho salmon populations are believed to occur in Seiad Creek, Grider Creek, Thompson Creek, Indian Creek, Elk Creek, Clear Creek, Dillon Creek (suspected), and Salmon River. Finally, between Orleans and Klamath (mouth of the river), coho salmon populations are believed to occur in Camp Creek, Red Cap Creek, Trinity River, Turwar Creek, Blue Creek, Tectah Creek, and Pine Creek.

The influence of IGD releases (relative to total Klamath River flow) decreases with distance downstream from the dam, and typically depends on time of year. The river reach between IGD and the Shasta River is heavily influenced by dam releases. During the July through October period between 1962 and 1991, IGD releases contributed an average of between about 60 and 85 percent of the river flow measured at Seiad (Figure 3). During this same period , IGD releases contributed an average of between about 50 and 65 percent of the river flow measured at Orleans (Figure 4). These averages increase during drought years. For example, monthly IGD releases contributed up to over 90 percent of the flow at Seiad during late summer in dry years.

Actual flows occurring in the Klamath River (measured at a given point) also depend on factors other than Project operations, including meteorological conditions (e.g., precipitation magnitude and timing) and other water management activities. For example, Figure 5 displays average daily flows in the Klamath River at IGD during the April through August 1998 period, as well as the minimum flow regime outlined in the ongoing Project operations BA (Reclamation 2001).

<u>Flow Study Activity and Recommendations</u>

This section of the opinion discusses previous and ongoing flow study activities and provides an interim flow recommendation for dry years, pending the outcome of further study. Additional information regarding the effects of Project operations on coho salmon is provided in the "Effects of Ongoing

Project Operations" section below.

Biologists with the CDFG conducted habitat measurements and visual estimates and concluded that any reduction in discharge below about 1,000 CFS would lead to a diminished fishery (Wales 1944). Wales (1944) also noted that any reduction in flows below 2,000 CFS, as measured around Fall Creek, would be expected to materially affect salmon and steelhead populations downstream to the Shasta River. In 1955, a CDFG biologist estimated that 1,000 CFS provided year-round would be required to maintain game fish at 1955 levels (Sletteland 1995).

On behalf of the Yurok Tribe, Trihey and Associates (1996) prepared a report including a quantification of the instream flows required to meet the needs of Tribal Trust species, including salmon and steelhead. In a companion report, Hecht and Kamman (1996) provided an analysis of the quantity and timing of historical stream flows and a discussion of the effect of Klamath Project operations on the flow regime. To estimate the minimum flow requirement, Trihey and Associates (1996) employed a modified Tennant (1976) method. This choice was driven, in part, by available data needed to utilize various estimation techniques. Sixty percent of the average pre-Project annual stream flow volume (estimated by Hecht and Kamman [1996]) was selected, and the recommended minimum IGD release schedule was "shaped" to more-closely resemble the pre-Project hydrograph. The recommended monthly instream requirements for Tribal Trust species were estimated to be: 1,200 CFS in October, 1,500 CFS between November and March, 2,000 CFS in April, 2,500 CFS in May, 1,700 CFS in June, and 1,000 CFS between July and September.

A final report prepared for the Department of the Interior provided substantial new analyses regarding flows required for fisheries below IGD (Phase 1 flow report, INSE 1999). Additional estimates of pre-Project flows under various water year-types were developed, and the results of various methods applied to estimate the appropriate flow regime needed to meet the habitat requirements of salmon and steelhead were also included. Specifically, the draft report discusses the potential use of many methods to determine instream flow requirements, and provides a summary of the results of those techniques used by INSE (1999) to estimate flow requirements. These techniques fall into two categories: hydrology-based methods and field-based methods. In light of the different flow regimes prescribed by these several techniques, and continuing uncertainty about which technique(s) should be employed in the Klamath River, results were averaged (on a monthly basis). These resulting flow regime was forwarded as an interim recommendation, until additional analyses can be completed. The INSE (1999) recommended the following interim monthly instream flows below IGD: 1,476, 1,688, 2,082, 2,421, 3,008, 3,073, 3,307, 3,056, 2,249, 1,714, 1,346, 1,395 CFS, during October through September, respectively.

Following the Phase 1 flow study, a follow-up "Phase 2" effort began, and included extensive coordination with a Technical Team representing fishery co-managers, including USFWS, CDFG, U.S.

Geological Survey, Yurok Tribe, Karuk Tribe, Hoopa Valley Tribe, and NMFS. In the initial stages, data was collected for one dimensional and two dimensional physical habitat modeling. Insufficient information was available to develop Klamath River-specific coho salmon habitat suitability criteria (HSC) for use in physical habitat modeling. During the Phase 2 flow study, preliminary "envelope" HSC incorporating those available in the literature for this species and life history stage was developed. Klamath River-specific HSC for chinook salmon fry and spawners were developed by the Technical Team and used in physical habitat modeling, and coho salmon fry generally require similar habitat characteristics. Because of the empirically observed importance of cover elements for small vulnerable fry (e.g., submerged and emergent vegetation), cover coding was incorporated into channel indexes and used to more rationally reflect habitat suitability (Phase 2 Technical Team, pers. comm., 2000; INSE in prep.)

Preliminary draft physical habitat modeling results are now available for the Iron Gate Dam to Shasta River reach of the Klamath River and for the Shasta River to Scott River reach. These results and additional information continue to be evaluated by the Technical Team. Figures 8 through Figure 12 show the preliminary draft estimates of suitable habitat in the Klamath River, by species and life history stage.

Prior to the completion of the Phase 2 effort, NMFS has developed flow recommendations for a "dry" year (as defined by Reclamation [2001]). These recommendations are designed to provide necessary increases in the expected survival of various life history stages of coho salmon relative to the proposed action (Reclamation 2001). The most current Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) UKL April through September inflow forecast (March 1, 2001) is for a "dry" year. Additional information and analyses are expected to be developed in the near future, and this may result in a more refined recommendation for dryer years as well as provide additional insight for other water year type flow recommendations. The NMFS intends to prepare a subsequent, supplemental biological opinion addressing all water year types.

During April and May, salmon fry are the most vulnerable life stage present in the Klamath River and the recommended IGD flow to protect required habitat is 2,100 CFS. As shown in Table 2, this flow would provide an estimated 57 and 53 percent of maximum available habitat for coho salmon fry that are present in the IGD to Shasta River reach and Shasta to Scott reach, respectively, during this period. Figures 11 illustrates that the amount of estimated coho salmon and chinook salmon fry habitat available to fish downstream of the Shasta River drops precipitously between 2,100 and about 1,300 CFS. "Dry" year average flows (1961-1997, from Reclamation 2001) during this period would result in approximately 40 and 18 percent of maximum available habitat in the IGD to Shasta reach and Shasta to Scott reach, respectively. Under the proposed action, "dry" year minimum flows (from Reclamation 2001) during this period would result in approximately 40 and 16 percent of maximum available habitat in the IGD to Shasta reach and Shasta to Scott reach, respectively. This flow is also recommended to increase the expected survival of coho salmon smolts outmigrating during this period, as discussed below.

During June, young-of-the-year salmon generally transition from the fry to juvenile life stage, and develop greater swimming abilities. As these fish grow larger, they are better equipped to seek alternative, suitable habitat in other locations. At the same time, Klamath River water temperatures increase and generally become inhospitable to salmon by late June. During this transition period between fry and juvenile habitat requirements, the recommended flow in June during dry years is 1,800 CFS between June 1 and 15, and 1,400 CFS between June 16 and 30. These flows are also recommended to increase the expected survival of coho salmon smolts outmigrating in June.

Water temperature and quality becomes a prime consideration during the July and August period, and while available physical habitat is still a consideration it is believed to be less important. Juvenile coho salmon that are in the Klamath River in the summer sometimes face lethal temperature and water quality conditions. In addition, these fish can more easily succumb to bacterial diseases under these water quality conditions (see CDFG 2000; S. Foote, USFWS biologist, pers. comm., 2000) resulting in increased mortailty. The NMFS is unaware of any particular, relevant new information regarding the relationship between IGD flow and water temperatures in the Klamath River. The preliminary temperature modeling information provided in the Phase 1 report (INSE 1999) and associated discussion suggests that, based on available information, base flows at or above 1,000 CFS create better water quality conditions. The recommended minimum flow for July and August in dry years is 1,000 CFS. Additionally, NMFS believes that further data collection and water temperature and quality modeling must be accomplished in the near future to better understand the relationship between IGD flows and Klamath River water conditions.

During September, water temperatures generally decrease from summer maximums. At this time, coho salmon adults enter the Klamath River and continue on into tributaries, and adequate passage conditions must be maintained. The relationship between IGD releases and downstream water temperatures is not fully understood, but modeling capabilities continue to be improved. Absent any new information suggesting that September IGD releases exacerbate poor water temperature and quality conditions, or new analyses of migration and spawning flows, the recommended flow is 1,300 CFS in September to provide for adequate adult migration passage conditions.

<u>Effects of Ongoing Project Operations</u>

<u>October through March</u>

Adult coho salmon migrate into the Klamath River between September and December (Weitcamp et al. 1995; Trihey and Associates 1996), and travel upstream and into tributaries to spawn. During this time, the requirements of adult coho salmon include a migratory corridor with suitable water depth and velocities, resting pools, and adequate water quality conditions. Successful immigration also depends on adequate fish passage conditions in the mainstem river and access to tributaries. Water depth and velocity of the mainstem Klamath River between the mouth and IGD will vary with water flows and are dependent upon meteorological conditions and water management activities. Under the proposed minimum flows included in the Project operations BA (Reclamation 2001), minimum IGD flows during the adult coho salmon inmigration season would vary from about 500 to 900 cfs in Critically Dry water years to about 1,000 to 1,300 cfs during Above Average water years. Because the proposed minimum flows are monthly or biweekly averages, instantaneous flows could be higher or lower. The actual IGD flows would vary within any given year depending on meteorological conditions, available water storage capacity in the upper Klamath Basin, and water management activities.

Mainstem Klamath River passage conditions for fall adult chinook salmon were examined in 1994 (Vogel and Marine). The authors provided a description of the factors that affect timing of the adult migration, including water temperature regimes, seasonal timing of instream flows, and natural timing of salmon reproductive physiological events (Vogel and Marine 1994). Vogel and Marine also note that (ca. 1994) specific reservoir releases necessary for adequate mainstem flows for salmon had not been defined.

Physical habitat modeling specific to adult coho salmon in the Klamath River has not occurred. Preliminary draft model results for chinook salmon spawning habitat indicates that spawning habitat is maximized at approximately 1,300 CFS in the Iron Gate Dam to Shasta River reach (Figure 12). It is reasonable to expect that adult coho salmon are able to migrate successfully given this discharge and downstream accretions. At potential flows under the proposed action (e.g., less than 900 CFS) chinook spawning habitat availability is reduced, and salmon passage conditions may deteriorate. Also, passage conditions from the mainstem river into some tributaries have been a concern under relatively low flow conditions (Vogel and Marine 1994), and tributary access would likely be adversely affected by the minimums that could occur in dryer water years. The potential adverse affects to mainstem passage conditions and tributary access may result in spawning migration delays or straying due to natal stream inaccessibility. Because adult salmon do not feed during their freshwater spawning migration, individuals have a finite amount of energy reserves. Consequently, increased pre-spawning mortality and decreased spawning success may result.

Available information indicates that, in general, water temperatures decrease in the mainstem Klamath River in October (Figure 6 and Figure 7). By mid-October, temperatures measured at IGD and at Seiad typically drop below 15E C and are within the range associated with normal coho salmon migration: 7.2E - 15.6E C (Reiser and Bjornn 1979). By mid-December, temperatures typically decrease below 7E C in these locations.

Coho salmon spawning typically occurs during December and January in the Klamath River Basin (Weitcamp et al. 1995). Although coho salmon have been observed spawning in the mainstem Klamath River (Reclamation 1998), this activity is probably not prevalent. Successful spawning is dependent in part on the availability of suitable conditions including substrate, water depth, water velocity and water quality. Water temperatures in the Klamath River during the December and January period (Figures 6 and 7) are typically within the acceptable range associated with coho salmon spawning in California: 5.6E - 13.3E C (Briggs 1953).

Coho salmon eggs incubate for about 35 to 50 days in gravel redds following successful spawning, and fry emerge from the gravel about two to three weeks after hatching (Hassler 1987). The survival of salmon eggs and alevins are dependent, in part, on stream and stream bed conditions. For example, high winter flows and resulting gravel movement can result in heavy losses (Sandercock 1991). As previously mentioned, flows released at IGD and downstream accretions are variable during this period. Water temperatures measured at Seiad are typically similar to those at IGD during this period (Figures 6 and 7), and fall within the preferred range for incubating salmonids (Bell 1991).

Water temperatures during this period are generally within a tolerable range for juvenile coho salmon (Figure 6 and 7; Bell 1991). In early autumn, as water temperatures decline, coho salmon fingerlings move into deeper pools featuring cover; by utilizing cover and side channels, some fish avoid being displaced downstream during winter freshets (Hartman 1965; Bustard and Narver 1975). Any coho salmon juveniles that survive displacement from tributary habitat due to unfavorable environmental conditions during the summer may find opportunities to migrate back to the tributaries as they become more hospitable (Sandercock 1991). In some situations, this type of migration may result in relatively high survival rates (Tschaplinski and Hartman 1983).

During this period juvenile coho also rear in the Klamath River. Given an adequate flow, e.g., 1,300 CFS, is provided for salmon passage, spawning, and incubation, adequate habitat for juveniles is expected

<u>April through June</u>

During this period, coho salmon fry rear in the mainstem Klamath River and some tributaries. After emergence from redds, these fish swim close to stream banks and seek available cover. As they become older, coho salmon move through a succession of preferred habitats: back eddies, log jams, undercut or open bank areas, and higher velocity water in midstream and the stream margins (Lister and Genoe 1970). During this time, feeding juvenile coho salmon are highly dependent on visual cues for locating and capturing insect material in suspension or on the water surface (Hoar 1958). Marginal slack water areas are particularly important for juvenile coho salmon as prey items found in midstream areas are generally unavailable to these fish.

Under the proposed minimum flows, the amount of suitable physical habitat for these fish could be dramatically reduced, especially during dry year flows (Figures 10 and 11). This would result in decreased carrying capacities for salmonid fry in the mainstem Klamath River and displacement of fry into less suitable habitat. Because of weak swimming abilities, fry are not well equipped to seek suitable habitats after displacement. As a result, the survival of salmon fry is expected to decrease under the proposed action.

Project operations may also affect the survival of young-of-the-year coho salmon through potential stranding of these fish during decreases in IGD flows. For example, Project operations during the week of April 19, 1998, appear to have resulted in stranding of fish. Flows through IGD dropped from 3,300 CFS to 1,800 CFS, resulting in the stranding of coho fry as well as other fish species (USFWS 1998). The extent of mortality was unknown, however, USFWS biologists rescued 7 coho salmon fry and 738 chinook salmon fry in 3 isolated edge water pools. In 1999, a similar change in flows was implemented over a longer time period to decrease potential stranding (L. Dugan, Fishery Biologist, Reclamation, pers. comm., April 9, 1999). Although Reclamation proposes to coordinate more closely with PacifiCorp regarding flow changes at IGD that may occur during this period in any given year, NMFS must expect that adverse impacts to coho salmon due to hourly and daily ramping rates would continue to occur at times under the proposed action.

Coho salmon from the previous year's cohort also migrate toward the sea as smolts during this period. The size of the fish, flow conditions, water temperature, dissolved oxygen levels, day length, and the availability of food all tend to affect the time of migration (Shapovalov and Taft 1954). In the Klamath River basin, coho salmon smolt migration generally occurs between March and June (Weitcamp et al. 1995) but continues into July (INSE 1999).

Coho salmon begin the smoltification process by beginning to defend their territories less vigorously and forming aggregations (Sandercock 1991), and they rise to the surface at night and move downstream (Hoar 1951). Several other physiologic and behavioral changes also accompany smoltification of Pacific salmonids, including negative rheotaxis and decreased swimming ability (McCormick and Saunders 1987). Both of these smolt attributes support the expectation that these fish would outmigrate faster with higher water velocities and experience higher survival because of lower travel time and associated mortality due to migratory delays, predation, and exposure to poor mainstem habitat conditions. Although the relationship between flow and smolt survival has not been studied in the Klamath River Basin, Cada et al. (1994) concluded that relevant studies in other geographic areas "generally supported the premise that increased flow led to increased smolt survival." Based on available information, smolt survival in the Klamath River is expected to be higher with higher flows, and lower with lower flows. Under the proposed minimum flows in the Project operations BA, flows could be relatively low during some years and, in turn, survival of coho salmon smolts could be poor.

By mid-March, water temperatures in the Klamath River typically exceed the "preferred" range of coho salmon described by Bell (1991). Prior to about mid-June, water temperatures measured at Seiad and below IGD are similar. From about mid-June through September, water released from IGD is typically several degrees C cooler than that measured at Seiad (Figure 6 and 7), and high water temperatures and poor water quality contribute to a hostile environment for salmon.

<u>July through September</u>

Most coho fry move out of river systems during freshets, and during periods of stable flow fry continue to migrate (Sandercock 1991). Coho fry are very territorial, and those fish that cannot find or defend a suitable territory are generally displaced downstream. If adjacent downstream habitat is occupied, migrants continue to be displaced downstream (Sandercock 1991). Some of those fish displaced downstream may later move back upstream, or they may migrate along the shoreline and enter other streams (Otto and McInerney 1970).

As a result of their behavior and available habitat, coho salmon juveniles are distributed along the mainstem Klamath River and tributary habitats. Suitable habitat for this life history stage includes adequate space, appropriate stream bed substrate for cover and food base production, cover components, adequate water quality and quantity, and areas of appropriate water velocity. Operation of the Project substantially affects summer flows in the Klamath River below IGD, and its influence extends further downstream during this period.

Water temperatures and quality contribute to a hostile environment for juvenile salmon during the summer. Temperatures are typically above the preferred range of coho salmon, and sometimes exceed their lethal limit of 25.5E C (Bell 1991). Although additional flow releases from IGD would not be expected to cool the mainstem river to the preferred range, higher flow releases from IGD than those that would occur under the proposed action during the June through September period are not expected to result in elevated water temperatures downstream. In addition, the increased thermal mass of higher IGD releases during this period would result in generally decreased diurnal temperature fluctuations that can be stressful to fish. Juvenile coho salmon that rear in the mainstem Klamath River would likely experience high mortality during this period under the proposed minimum flows. Although the relationship between IGD flow and water temperature and quality is not fully understood, available information indicates that base flows at or above 1,000 CFS create better water quality conditions (see INSE 1999).

In summary, juvenile coho salmon in the Klamath River during this period are expected to encounter marginal to lethal water quality conditions. Daily average and maximum water temperatures are quite high, and the diurnal variation of temperatures is also stressful to fish. Further, survival of this life history stage is suspected to be a production bottleneck.

Summary of Effects

Operation of the Klamath Project can potentially affect several coho salmon life history stages: Migrating adults, spawning adults, incubating eggs, rearing fry and juveniles, and migrating smolts. The expected survival and reproduction of coho salmon in the freshwater environment can be conceptually thought of as a product of the component survival values of these life history stages. Except for the summer period, the extent to which Project operations affect coho salmon and their habitat is variable during most years, being somewhat dependent on meteorological conditions. However, the Project substantially affects flows and fish habitat during the June through September period in all years. This includes the low flow period when water quality in the Klamath River is a substantial problem. One constituent water quality element is temperature, and this is linked to dissolved oxygen saturation levels. Water temperatures and dissolved oxygen levels vary in daily cycles, and between days, months, and years. Because of the typically degraded water temperatures in the Klamath River during the summer period, the INSE (1999) suggested that the flow dependent nature of the thermal regime on a seasonal basis needs to be factored into any flow recommendations.

Trihey and Associates (1996) recommended higher summer flows than the IGD FERC license minimums, as these additional flows are expected to "(1) reduce the growth of aquatic plants and algae, (2) provide additional wetted and surface turbulence in riffles, and (3) provide a larger volume of water in the river channel to decrease the amplitude of daily stream temperature cycles." The INSE (1999) summarized a preliminary modeling effort to simulate water temperatures near Seiad Valley (river mile 129) under a number of summer flow scenarios between 200 and 3,000 CFS. From this "first approximation" analysis, INSE (1999) preliminarily concluded that the results demonstrated a clear relationship between flow release and thermal response in the river, and that at flows below about 1,000 CFS, adverse thermal extremes were expected to be exacerbated.

Based on the best available information, NMFS believes that the ongoing operation of the Klamath Project according to the proposed action will adversely affect coho salmon populations in the Klamath River. In particular, Project operations can adversely affect Klamath River aquatic habitat in the summer, and exacerbate adverse temperature and water quality conditions suspected to cause a coho salmon production bottleneck. Several factors are believed to affect the survival of juvenile coho salmon in the Klamath River during the summer, including the availability of suitable habitat (water depth and velocity, and cover), the availability of cool water refugia, ambient water temperatures and diurnal fluctuations, and water quality (e.g., dissolved oxygen). These factors are all affected by the magnitude and timing of IGD flows.

A major difficulty in determining the requirements for survival and recovery of coho salmon ESUs is the substantial degree of uncertainty regarding their status, population trends, and genetic integrity. The combination of existing and imminent risks and uncertainty regarding the status, population trends, and genetics of the SONCC coho salmon ESU dictates that the NMFS establish the following conservative assumptions regarding population factors for carrying out the ESA Section 7(a)(2) analysis described in this document:

1. The SONCC coho salmon is comprised of multiple populations, each of which may be uniquely adapted to local sub-basin or watershed environments. Preservation of the remaining genetic diversity embodied in these undefined populations may be essential for the survival and recovery of each population as a whole.

2. All SONCC coho salmon populations within this ESU are depressed relative to their past abundance, based on the limited data available (July 25, 1995, 60 FR 38011; May 6, 1997, 62 FR 24588). The main populations in this ESU (Rogue River, Klamath River, and Trinity River) are heavily influenced by hatcheries, apparently with little natural production. The apparent declines in production suggest that the natural populations are not self-sustaining. These declines in natural production are suspected to be related, at least in part, to degraded conditions of the essential features of spawning and rearing habitat in many areas of the SONCC coho salmon ESU.

3. The status of coho salmon populations within this ESU are depressed relative to their past abundance, based on the limited data available: In the 1940s, estimated abundance of coho salmon in this ESU ranged from 50,000 to 125,000 native coho salmon, while in 1996, it was estimated that there were probably less than 6,000 naturally-reproducing coho salmon (October 31, 1996, 61 FR 56138).

Based on these assumptions, the NMFS believes that the conservation of populations that comprise each ESU must be ensured when conducting section 7 consultation analyses. While these assumptions are necessarily conservative to minimize risk to a population in the face of limited information, they will be appropriately modified when better information becomes available.

Using the above assumptions, NMFS considers Klamath River coho salmon to be necessary for the continued survival and recovery of the SONCC ESU. Operation of the Project according to the preferred alternative would generally result in degraded habitat condition, even when compared to the last 40 years when the FERC minimum flow schedule generally guided Project operations with regard to Klamath River flows. Given the status of Klamath River coho salmon, the proposed action constitutes an unacceptable risk. Based on available information, NMFS has determined Project operation under the proposed action included in the ongoing Project BA (Reclamation 2001) is expected to result in an appreciably reduced likelihood that SONCC coho salmon will both survive and recover in the wild.

<u>SONCC Coho Salmon Critical Habitat</u>

Designated critical habitat for SONCC coho salmon occurs downstream of IGD (May 5, 1999; 64 FR 24049). In designating critical habitat, NMFS focuses on the known physical and biological features (primary constituent elements) within the designated area that are essential to the conservation of the species. These essential features may include, but are not limited to, spawning sites, food resources, water quality and quantity, and riparian vegetation. Within the essential habitat types (spawning, rearing, juvenile migration corridors), essential features of coho salmon critical habitat include adequate: (1) substrate, (2) water quality, (3) water quantity, (4) water temperature, (5) water velocity, (6) cover/shelter, (7) food, (8) riparian vegetation, (9) space, and (10) safe passage conditions (May 5, 1999; 64 FR 24049).

As previously discussed, the ongoing operation of the Project is expected to result in changes to the hydrograph in the Klamath River below IGD, and affects available fish habitat, water temperatures, and dissolved oxygen levels during the summer period. Operation of the Project during the 1962 to 1997 period similarly affected fish habitat. The extent to which Project operation may appreciably diminish the value of proposed critical habitat for both the survival and recovery of SONCC coho salmon currently depends, in part, on IGD flow schedules in any given year. As previously mentioned, the proposed Project operation includes managing water to meet the lowest average monthly or biweekly IGD flows on record for the 1961 to 1997 period (by water year type). In addition, because the proposed minimum flows are monthly or biweekly averages, instantaneous flows could be much lower. As discussed above, all necessary freshwater habitats required by coho salmon could be adversely affected, especially during dryer years. The level of potential adverse affects of Project operation on mainstem Klamath River habitat is greater under the proposed Project operation that during the 1961 through 1997 period. During this period, the status of Klamath River coho salmon declined and ultimately contributed to their listing under the ESA, in part due to mainstem Klamath River habitat conditions. Therefore, NMFS has determined that existing proposed critical habitat is likely to be affected so as to appreciably diminish the value of designated critical habitat for both the survival and recovery of the species.

Cumulative Effects

Cumulative effects are defined in 50 CFR 402.02 as "those effects of future State or private activities, not involving Federal activities, that are reasonably certain to occur within the action area of the Federal action subject to consultation." For the purposes of this analysis, the action area encompasses the Project and downstream aquatic habitat below IGD in the Klamath River.

The dominant land-use activities on non-federal lands adjacent to the action area are forestry and agriculture. Significant improvements in SONCC coho salmon production within non-Federal lands are unlikely without changes in forestry, agriculture, and other practices that occur in riparian areas.

Now that SONCC coho salmon are listed as threatened, the NMFS assumes that non-Federal land owners will recognize the need to take steps to curtail or avoid land management practices that may result in potential unauthorized take of listed coho salmon. For actions on non-Federal lands which the land owner or administering non-Federal agency believes are likely to result in adverse effects to SONCC coho salmon or their habitat, the land owner or agency should contact NMFS regarding the appropriate section 10 incidental take permits, which require submission of Habitat Conservation Plans. If an incidental take permit is requested, NMFS would seek appropriate measures to avoid or minimize adverse affects and taking of listed and proposed anadromous fish.

Until improvements in non-Federal land management practices are actually implemented, the NMFS assumes that future private and State actions will continue at similar intensities as in recent years. Given the degraded environmental baseline for listed and proposed Pacific salmonids, actions that do not lead to improvement in habitat conditions over time could contribute to species extinctions.

Future Federal actions, including the ongoing operation of hydropower systems, hatcheries, fisheries, and land management activities are being (or have been) reviewed through separate section 7 consultation processes. In addition, non-Federal actions that require authorization under section 10 of the ESA will be considered in the environmental baseline for future section 7 consultations.

Conclusion

After reviewing the current status of SONCC coho salmon, the environmental baseline for the action area, the effects of the proposed action (i.e., ongoing operation of the Klamath Project on into the future), and cumulative effects, it is NMFS' biological opinion that the action, as proposed, is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of SONCC coho salmon. The NMFS has also determined that the action, as proposed, is likely to adversely modify critical habitat for the SONCC coho salmon.

Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives

Regulations (50 CFR §402.02) implementing section 7 of the ESA define reasonable and prudent alternatives as alternative actions, identified during formal consultation, that: (1) can be implemented in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the action; (2) can be implemented consistent with the scope of the action agency's legal authority and jurisdiction; (3) are economically and technologically feasible; and (4) would, NMFS believes, avoid the likelihood of jeopardizing the continued existence of listed species or resulting in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat.

This biological opinion has identified one reasonable and prudent alternative that, NMFS believes, meets the criteria outlined above. A basic premise for this reasonable and prudent alternative is that operation of the Klamath Project substantially affects flows, fish habitat, and water quality in the Klamath River below IGD. The second premise is that the existence and operation of the Klamath

Project is not the only factor and human activity that adversely affects aquatic habitat and anadromous salmonid populations in the Klamath River. Accordingly, NMFS prepared this reasonable and prudent alternative with an awareness of the larger context of actions that will affect threatened salmon in the Klamath River.

Finally, this reasonable and prudent alternative is not intended to immediately reverse the rate at which listed species in the Klamath River decline. Our jeopardy determination is generally based on the expectation that the proposed operation of the Project would result in a continued decline in habitat conditions in the Klamath River relative to Project operations during previous decades. Further, the proposed operation of the Project is not based on the biological requirements of the species. The reasonable and prudent alternative is intended to prevent further decline of the listed fish that we concluded were likely to be jeopardized by the proposed action while longer-term protections can be implemented to effect the recovery of the species. The NMFS expects that further aquatic habitat studies, restoration planning, and restoration accomplishments will necessitate occasional adjustments to this reasonable and prudent alternative or perhaps other reasonable and prudent alternatives will be identified over time.

<u>Reasonable and Prudent Alternative</u>

The "Flow Study and Recommendations" section of this biological opinion provides the basis for the river flow-related portion of this RPA. Specifically, the recommended flows included in that section of the opinion are forwarded below as part of the reasonable and prudent alternative.

1. Reclamation will coordinate with NMFS and USFWS during annual Project operation planning between February through April (or longer, as appropriate) to achieve a review of water supply forecasts and Project operational details.

    a. Reclamation will provide NMFS and USFWS with the annual February 1, March 1, and April 1 NRCS forecasts used for planning, including the 90 percent and 70 percent exceedance forecasts for the April through September Upper Klamath Lake inflow.

2. Reclamation will operate the Project to provide for the following instantaneous minimum flows (CFS) below Iron Gate Dam, by water year type determined using the April 1 70 percent exceedance forecast:

Time Step	Iron Gate Dam Discharge
Oct.	
Nov.	
Dec.	
Jan.	
Feb.	
Mar. 1-15	
Mar. 16-31	
Apr. 1-15	1,700
Apr.16-30	2,100
May 1-15	2,100
May 16-31	2,100
Jun. 1-15	1,800
Jun. 16-31	1,400
Jul. 1-15	1,000
Jul. 16-31	1,000
Aug.	1,000
Sep.	1,300

a. Reclamation will operate the Project to provide for the following recommended down ramping rates below Iron Gate Dam: (1) decreases in flows of 300 CFS or less per 24-hour period and no more than 125 CFS per four-hour period when IGD flows are above 1,750 CFS; or (2) decreases in flows of 150 CFS or less per 24-hour period and no more than 50 CFS per two-hour period when IGD flows are 1,750 CFS or less.

3. If, based on the best available information (e.g., the March 1 NRCS forecasts and associated model output), Reclamation expects they will be unable to operate the Project to provide for the above minimum flow regime and maximum down ramping rates below IGD while also complying with the ESA requirements regarding listed species under the jurisdiction of the USFWS, NMFS and USFWS determine how best to meet the biological requirements of all species of concern. Potential in-season management of scarce water resources to protect aquatic resources may include (this list is not exhaustive):

    a. Consideration of the current status of species of concern and risks associated with critically dry years;

    b. Consideration of the most-up-to-date information regarding the location, size, and movements of young-of-the-year and juvenile fish;

    c. Consideration of the most up-to-date expectations of water quality parameters in Upper Klamath Lake and the Klamath River below IGD, given the expected water supply outlook;

    d. Consideration of pro-rating IGD releases or UKL elevation regimes based on "within water year type" exceedance levels for critically dry years;

    e. Consideration of reserving a volume of water for release below IGD during particularly hot period(s) to improve water quality;

4. The NMFS and USFWS will consider the need to revise this reasonable and prudent alternative, and perhaps any ESA requirements regarding listed species under USFWS jurisdiction, on an *ad hoc* basis. Reclamation may also request review of ESA requirements.

    a. The NMFS and USFWS will review this reasonable and prudent alternative, and perhaps any ESA requirements regarding listed species under USFWS jurisdiction, within 5 years of the issuance of this biological opinion;

    b. Reclamation will reinitiate ESA section 7 consultation with NMFS and/or USFWS as soon as possible upon written request from either NMFS or USFWS.

Because this biological opinion has found jeopardy and adverse modification of critical habitat, Reclamation is required to notify NMFS of its final decision on implementation of the reasonable and prudent alternative.

Incidental Take Statement

Section 9 of the ESA and federal regulations adopted pursuant to section 4(d) of the ESA prohibit the take of endangered and threatened species, respectively, without special exemption. "Take" is defined as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Harm is further defined by NMFS to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Harass is defined as intentional or negligent actions that create the likelihood of injury to listed species to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding or sheltering. Incidental take is defined as take that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity. Under the terms of section 7(b)(4) and section 7(o)(2), taking that is incidental to and not intended as part of the agency action is not considered to be prohibited taking under the ESA provided that such taking is in compliance with the terms and conditions of this incidental take statement.

[INSERT]

This incidental take statement is effective provided that Reclamation implements the reasonable and prudent alternative above.

<u>Reasonable and Prudent Measures</u>
The NMFS believes that the following reasonable and prudent measures are necessary and appropriate to minimize the likelihood of take of SONCC coho salmon resulting from the ongoing operation of the Project.

Reclamation shall:

1. Arrange for the ongoing collection and analysis of information to further understand the relationship between IGD water releases and suitable downstream salmon habitat in the Klamath River;

2. Continue its efforts to identify additional water supplies in the Klamath Basin.

<u>Terms and Conditions</u>
In order to enjoy the protections provided under section 7(b)(4) or 7(o)(2) of the ESA, Reclamation must comply with the following terms and conditions, which implement and document implementation of the reasonable and prudent measures described above. These terms and conditions are non-discretionary. Reclamation shall do the following:

1. In coordination with PacifiCorp, provide for the completion, integration, and/or modifications of

water routing and water quality models that potentially provide an increased understanding of water temperature and quality conditions in Upper Klamath Lake and in the lower Klamath River. Development of this integrated model(s) should be coordinated with fishery co-managers and other water quality experts, and shall be completed by January 2002.

2. Provide a summary report outlining the status of the water supply initiative, identified opportunities with regard to water supplies, and current scoping of implementation strategies. This report will be provided to NMFS by February 2002.

Conservation Recommendations

Section 7(a)(1) of the ESA directs Federal agencies to utilize their authorities to further the purposes of the ESA by carrying out conservation programs for the benefit of the threatened and endangered species. Conservation recommendations are discretionary measures suggested to minimize or avoid adverse effects of a proposed action on listed species, to minimize or avoid adverse modification of critical habitat, or to develop additional information.

The NMFS believes the following conservation recommendations are consistent with these obligations, and therefore recommends that the following conservation measures be implemented by Reclamation:

1. Reclamation should aggressively seek sufficient funding to continue and enhance their Klamath Basin Water Supply Initiative.

2. Reclamation should actively participate with other entities with an active interest in addressing Klamath River fishery, habitat, and water quality restoration.

Reinitiation of Consultation

This concludes formal consultation on Reclamation's proposed ongoing operation of the Project. As provided in 50 CFR §402.16, reinitiation of formal consultation is required where discretionary Federal agency involvement or control over the action has been retained (or is authorized by law) and if: (1) the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded; (2) new information reveals effects of the agency action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not considered in this opinion; (3) the agency action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species or critical habitat not considered in this opinion; or (4) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the action.

Literature Cited

Bartholow, J.M. 1995. Review and analysis of Klamath River basin water temperatures as a factor in the decline of anadromous fish with recommendations for mitigation. River Systems Management Section, Midcontinent Ecological Science Center, U.S. National Biological Service, Fort Collins, Colorado. Final Draft.

Bell, M. C. 1991. Fisheries handbook of engineering requirements and biological criteria. Fish Passage Development and Evaluation Program, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, North pacific Division, Portland, Oregon.

Briggs, J.C. 1953. The behavior and reproduction of salmonid fishes in a small coastal stream. Calif. Dep. Fish Game Fish. Bull. 94:62 p.

Brown, L.R, and P.B. Moyle. 1991. Status of coho salmon in California. Report to the Natl. Mar. Fish. Serv., 114 pages. (Available from Natl. Mar. Fish. Serv., Environmental and Technical Services Division, 525 N.E. Oregon Street, Portland, OR 97232).

Brown, L.R., P.B. Moyle, and R.M. Yoshiyama. 1994. Historical decline and current status of coho salmon in California. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 14:237-261.

Bustard, D.R., and D.W. Narver. 1975. Aspects of the winter ecology of juvenile coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) and steelhead trout (*Salmo gairdneri*). J. Fish. Res. Board Can. 32:667-680.

Cada, G.F., M.D. Deacon, S.V. Mitz, and M.S. Bevelhimer. 1994. Review of information pertaining to the effect of water velocity on the survival of juvenile salmon and steelhead in the Columbia River Basin. Prepared by Oak Ridge National Laboratory for the Northwest Power Planning Council, Portland, Oregon. February. 71 p.

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 1994. Petition to the California Board of Forestry to list coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) as a sensitive species. Calif. Dep. Fish Game Rep. 35 pages plus appendices. (Available from Board of Forestry, 1416 Ninth, Sacramento, CA 95814).

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 2000. Documentation of the Klamath River Fish Kill, June 2000. Attachment to an October 25, 2000, Memorandum from G. Stacey, CDFG, to D. Koch, CDFG. 17 p. plus appendix.

Campbell, S. G. 1995. Klamath River Basin flow-related scoping study - phase I, water quality. In:

Compilation of phase I reports for the Klamath River Basin, May 1995. Prepared for the Technical Work Group of the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force by River Systems Management Section, National Biological Service, Midcontinent Ecological Service Center, Fort Collins, CO

Chamberlin, T. W., R. D. Harr, and F. H. Everest. 1991. Timber harvesting, silviculture, and watershed processes. Pages 181-205 *in* W.R. Meehan (ed.), Influences of Forest and Rangeland Management. American Fisheries Society Special Publication 19.

Furniss, M. J., T. D. Roelofs, and C. S. Yee. 1991. Road construction and maintenance. Pages 297-323 *in* W.R. Meehan (ed.), Influences of Forest and Rangeland Management. American Fisheries Society Special Publication 19.

Gregory, S.V. and P.A. Bisson. 1997. Degradation and loss of anadromous salmonid habitat in the Pacific Northwest. Pages 277-314 *in* D.J. Stroud, P.A. Bisson, and R.J. Naiman, eds., Pacific Salmon and Their Ecosystems – Status and Future Options.

Hartman, G.F. 1965. The role of behaviour in the ecology and interaction of underyearling coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) and steelhead trout (*Salmo gairdneri*). J. Fish. Res. Board Can. 22:1035-1081.

Hartman, G.F., and J.C. Scrivener. 1990. Impacts of forest practices on a coastal stream ecosystem, Carnation Creek, British Columbia. Canadian Bulletin of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 223.

Hassler, T.J. 1987. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Southwest)--coho salmon. U.S. Fish and Wildl. Serv. Biol. Rep. 82(11.70). 19 pages.

Hecht, B., and G. R. Kamman. 1996. Initial Assessment of Pre- and Post-Klamath Project Hydrology on the Klamath River and Impacts of the Project on Instrean Flows and Fishery Habitat. Balance Hydrologics., Inc. March.

Heifetz, J., M.L. Murphy, and K.V. Koski. 1986. Effects of logging on winter habitat of juvenile salmonids in Alaskan streams. N. Am. J. Fish. Manage. 6:52-58.

Henriksen, J. 1995. Availability of life history information for anadromousfish in the Klamath and Trinity Rivers. In: Compilation of phase I reports for the Klamath River Basin, May 1995. Prepared for the Technical Work Group of the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force by River Systems Management Section, National Biological Service, Midcontinent Ecological Service Center, Fort Collins, CO

Hicks, B. J., Hall, J. D., Bisson, P. A., and J. R. Sedell. 1991. Responses of salmonids to habitat changes. Pages 483-518 *in* W.R. Meehan (ed.), Influences of Forest and Rangeland Management. American Fisheries Society Special Publication 19.

Higgins, P., S. Dobush, and D. Fuller. 1992. Factors in northern California threatening stocks with extinction. Unpubl. manuscr., Humboldt Chapter Am. Fish. Soc., 24 p. (Available from Humboldt Chapter of the American Fisheries Society, P.O. Box 210, Arcata, CA 95521.)

Hoar, W.S. 1951. The behaviour of chum, pink, and coho salmon in relation to seaward migration. J. Fish. Res. Board Can. 8:241-263.

_____. 1958. The evolution of migratory behaviour among juvenile salmon of the genus *Oncorhynchus*. J. Fish. Res. Board Can. 15391-428.

Hydrosphere Data Products, Inc. 1993. Hydrodata Regional CD-ROMs: U.S. Geological Survey daily values, Vols. West 1, West 2. (Available from Hydrosphere Data products, Inc., 1002 Walnut, Suite 200, Boulder, CO 80302)

Institute For Natural Systems Engineering (INSE). 1999. Evaluation of interim instream flow needs in the Klamath River: Phase I final report. Prepared for the Department of Interior. 53 p. plus appendixes.

Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force (KRBFTF). 1991. Long Range Plan for the Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Fishery Restoration Program. Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force. January.

Lister, D.B., and H.S. Genoe. 1970. Stream habitat utilization by cohabitating underyearlings of chinook (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) and coho (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) salmon in the Big Qualicum River, British Columbia. J. Fish. Res. Board Can. 27:1215-1224.

McCormick, S.D., and R.L. Saunders. 1987. Preparatory physiological adaptations for marine life of salmonids: Osmoregulation, growth, and metabolism. Amer. Fish. Soc. Symposium 1:211-229.

Meehan, W. R., editor. 1991. Influences of forest and rangeland management on salmonid fishes and their habitats. American Fisheries Society Special Publication 19.

Murphy, M.L. 1995. Forestry impacts on freshwater habitat of anadromous salmonids in the Pacific northwest and Alaska - Requirements for protection and restoration. NOAA Coastal Ocean Program Decision Analysis Series No. 7. NOAA Coastal Ocean Office, Silver Spring, MD.

156 p.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 1997. Impacts of California sea lions and Pacific harbor seals on salmonids and on the coastal ecosystems of Washington, Oregon, and California. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-24.

National Research Council (NRC). 1996. Upstream: Salmon and society in the Pacific Northwest. National Academy Press. Washington, DC.

Nehlsen, W., J.E. Williams, and J.A. Lichatowich. 1991. Pacific salmon at the crossroads: Stocks at risk from California, Oregon, Idaho, and Washington. Fisheries 16(2):4-21.

Nickelson, T.E., J.W. Nicholas, A.M. McGie, R.B. Lindsay, D.L. Bottom, R.J. Kaiser, and S.E. Jacobs. 1992. Status of anadromous salmonids in Oregon coastal basins. Unpublished manuscript. Oregon Dept. Fish Wildl., Research and Development Section, Corvallis, and Ocean Salmon Management, Newport. 83 pages.

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. 1998. Transmittal letter for Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Waterbodies for California's North Coast Region. January 14.

Odum, E.P. 1971. Fundamentals of ecology, 3rd Ed. Saunders College Publishing. Philadelphia, PA.

Otto, R.G., and J.E. McInerney. 1970. Development of salinity preference in pre-smolt coho salmon, *Oncorhynchus kisutch*. J. Fish. Res. Board Can. 27:793-800.

Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC). 1997. Preseason Report III Analysis of Council Adopted Management Measures for 1997 Ocean Salmon Fisheries. May 1997. (Available from PFMC, 2130 SW Fifth Ave. Ste. 224, Portland, OR 97201)

PFMC. 1998. Preseason Report III Analysis of Council Adopted Management Measures for 1998 Ocean Salmon Fisheries. May 1998.

PFMC. 1999. Preseason Report III Analysis of Council Adopted Management Measures for 1999 Ocean Salmon Fisheries. May 1999.

Reclamation (United States Bureau of Reclamation). 1998. Biological assessment on the Klamath Project 1998 operations plan. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region, Klamath Area Office. Klamath Falls, Oregon. May. 76 p.

Reclamation. 1999. Draft Klamath Project 1999 annual operations plan environmental assessment. U.S. Department of the Interior.

Reclamation. 2001. Biological assessment of the Klamath Project's continuing operations on southern Oregon/northern California ESU coho salmon and critical habitat for southern Oregon/northern California ESU coho salmon. Mid-Pacific Region, Klamath Area Office. 54 p. Enclosure to a January 22, 2001, letter from K. Wirkus, Reclamation, to R. Lent, NMFS.

Richter, B.D., J.V. Baumgartner, J. Powell, and D.P. Braun. 1996. A method for assessing hydrologic alteration within ecosystems. Conservation Biology 10(4):1163-74.

Sandercock, F.K. 1991. Life history of coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*). Pages 397-445 *in* C. Groot and L. Margolis (eds.), Pacific salmon life histories. Univ. British Columbia Press, Vancouver. 564 pages.

Sletteland, T.B. 1995. Letter to Michael J. Ryan (Reclamation), and enclosure titled "Events Leading to the Construction of Iron Gate Dam and the Basis for Minimum Flow Releases to the Klamath River."

Shapovalov, L., and A.C. Taft. 1954. The life histories of the steelhead rainbow trout (*Salmo gairneri gairdneri*) and silver salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) with special reference to Waddell Creek, California, and recommendations regarding their management. Calif. Dep. Fish Game, Fish Bull. 98. 375 p.

Smith, O.R. 1939. Placer mining silt and its relation to salmon and trout on the Pacific Coast. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 69:135-139.

Spence, B.C., G.A. Lomnicky, R.M. Hughes, and R.P. Novitzki. 1996. An Ecosystem Approach to Salmonid Conservation. Management Technology. December. 356 p.

Sullivan, K., T. E. Lisle, C. A. Dolloff, G. E. Grant, and L. M. Reid. 1987. Stream channels: the link between forests and fishes. Pages 39-97 *in* Salo and Cundy (1987).

Tennant, D.L. 1976. Instream flow regimes for fish, wildlife, recreation and related environmental resources. Fisheries 1(4): 6-10.

Thomas, J.W. et al. 1993. Viability assessments and management considerations for species associated with late-successional and old-growth forests of the Pacific northwest: The report of the Scientific Analysis Team. USDA, Forest Service Research. March. 530 p.

Trihey and Associates. 1996. Instream Flow Requirements for Tribal Trust Species in the Klamath River. Prepared on behalf of the Yurok Tribe. March. 43 p.

Tschaplinski, P.J., and G. F. Hartman. 1983 winter distribution of juvenile coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) before and after logging in Carnation Creek, British Columbia, and some implications for overwinter survival. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 40:452-461.

UDSA, Forest Service et al. 1993. Forest Ecosystem Management: An ecological, economic, and social assessment. Report of the Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team (FEMAT). July.

USDA, Forest Service and USDI, Bureau of Land Management. 1994. Record of decision for amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management planning documents within the range of the northern sported owl; standards and guidelines for management of habitat for late-successional and old-growth forest related species within the range of the northern spotted owl. April.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1993. Letter to State Water Resources Control Board with Staff Report Supporting Final Action California 303(d) List. October 19.

USFWS. 1997. Letter and report to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding dissolved oxygen levels in the Klamath River. September 23.

USFWS. 1998.

Vogel, D. A., and K. R. Marine. 1994. Preliminary assessment of increased Klamath River flows for salmon during the late summer and fall of 1994. A report prepared for the Klamath Water Users Association. Vogel Environmental Services. 36 pp.

Wales, J.H. 1944. The Klamath River at Different Stages of Flow. California Department of Fish and Game. Inland Fisheries Branch. Administrative Report 44-25, dated November 13, 1944. 13p.

Weitkamp, L.A., T.C. Wainwright, G.J. Bryant, G.B. Milner, D.J. Teel, R.G. Kope, and R.S. Waples. 1995. Status review of coho salmon from Washington, Oregon, and California. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-24, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, Washington. 258 pages.

The Wilderness Society. 1993. The living landscape, Volume 2. Pacific salmon on Federal lands. The Wilderness Society, Bolle Center for Forest Ecosystem management, Seattle, WA. 87 pp + appendices.

Tables

Table 1. Proposed average minimum flows at Iron Gate Dam on the Klamath River (from Table 4, Reclamation 2001).

Time Step	Above Average Water Years	Below Average Water Years	Dry Water Years	Critically Dry Water Years
Oct	1329	1308	852	904
Nov	1337	1324	873	909
Dec	1387	1435	889	914
Jan	1127	1334	888	1011
Feb	910	1546	747	525
Mar 1-15	1953	1439	725	501
Mar 16-31	2101	1748	724	521
Apr 1-15	1781	1455	728	569
Apr 16-30	1629	1305	754	574
May 1-15	1730	1010	761	525
May 16-31	1026	1003	924	501
Jun 1-15	760	728	712	476
Jun 16-30	742	696	612	536
Jul 1-15	705	709	547	429
Jul 16-31	680	682	542	427
Aug	1011	701	647	398
Sep	1035	725	749	538

Table 2. Estimated weighted usable area, expressed as a percentage of the maximum, for coho salmon and chinook salmon in the Iron Gate to Shasta River and Shasta River to Scott River reaches of the Klamath River. Underlying data are displayed in Figures 10 and 11. Pre-Project 90% exceedance flow estimates are from INSE (1999), and are included for comparison purposes. 1961-1997 average and minimum values (for biweekly time steps) are from Reclamation (2001).

April Dry Year		Estimated Percent of Maximum Fry Habitat			
		Iron Gate Dam to Shasta River		Shasta River to Scott River	
Iron Gate Dam Discharge (cubic feet per second)		Coho Salmon	Chinook Salmon	Coho Salmon	Chinook Salmon
Pre-Project 90% Exceedance Flow	2,771	67	86	51	62
1961-1997 Dry Year Average	1,183 1,039	43 41	55 53	19 18	23 20
1961-1997 Dry Year Minimum	728 754	40 40	50 50	15 16	16 16
Recommended Flows	2,100	57	75	53	62

May Dry Year		Estimated Percent of Maximum Fry Habitat			
		Iron Gate Dam to Shasta River		Shasta River to Scott River	
Iron Gate Dam Discharge (cubic feet per second)		Coho Salmon	Chinook Salmon	Coho Salmon	Chinook Salmon
Pre-Project 90% Exceedance Flow	2,560	65	84	53	61
1961-1997 Dry Year Average	968 996	40 40	52 53	18 18	18 18
1961-1997 Dry Year Minimum	761 924	40 40	50 52	16 17	16 18
Recommended Flows	2,100	57	75	53	62

Figures

DRAFT



Figure 1. Average Klamath River flow at Keno, Oregon - Historic median, 25th and 75th percentile (1905-1913; 5 day moving average). Data are from Hydrosphere Data Products, Inc. (1993).

DRAFT



Figure 2. Average Klamath River flow at Iron Gate Dam, California - Normal water year median, 25th and 75th percentile (1963, 1966, 1969, 1970, 1973, 1985, 1989; 5 day moving average). Data are from Hydroshere Data Products, Inc. (1993).



Figure 3. Monthly average Iron Gate Dam contributions to Klamath River flows measured at Seiad (1962-1991). Data are from Hydrosphere Data Products, Inc. (1993).



Figure 4. Monthly average Iron Gate Dam contributions to Klamath River flows measured at Orleans (1962-1991). Data are from Hydrosphere Data Products, Inc. (1993).

DRAFT



Figure 5. Daily average Klamath River flows measured at Iron Gate Dam (April through August, 1998). Bold line is the minimum flow regime from the 1998 biological assessment of Klamath Project operations (Reclamation 1998).

DRAFT



Figure 6. Average daily maximum water temperatures in the Klamath River below Iron Gate Dam (1963-1979). Acute and chronic high temperature thresholds are 1986 Environmental Protection Agency criteria (Campbell 1995). Data are from Hydrosphere Data Products, Inc (1993).



Figure 7. Average daily maximum water temperatures in the Klamath River at Seiad (1964-1978). Data are from Hydrosphere Data Products, Inc. (1993).

DRAFT



Figure 8. Normalized estimates of weighted usable area for various salmon and steelhead life history stages in the Iron Gate Dam to Shasta River reach of the Klamath River. Data are from INSE (in prep.).

DRAFT



Figure 9. Normalized estimates of weighted useable area for various salmon and steelhead life history stages in the Shasta River to Scott River reach of the Klamath River. Data are from INSE (in prep.).



Figure 10. Normalized estimates of weighted useable area for coho salmon and chinook salmon fry in the Iron Gate Dam to Shasta River reach of the Klamath River. Data are from INSE (in prep.).



Figure 11. Normalized estimates of weighted useable area for coho salmon and chinook salmon fry in the Shasta River to Scott River reach of the Klamath River. Data are from INSE (in prep.).



Figure 12. Normalized estimates of weighted useable area for chinook salmon spawning in the Iron Gate Dam to Shasta River reach of the Klamath River. Data are from INSE (in prep.).